

I fully support Kabat's proposal to suppress Kaicher's *Card Catalogue* for nomenclatural purposes. The main argument I would see against suppression would be that the *Card Catalogue* is not a true publication and especially that it was not intended to establish a permanent scientific record. However, that is, as already pointed out by Kabat, something that may be regarded differently by different researchers. Therefore, and especially in order not to have a number of inappropriate lectotypes selected by inference of holotype, I urge the Commission to use its powers to suppress the *Card Catalogue* for nomenclatural purposes.

Comment on the proposed conservation of the generic name *Glomeris* Latreille, 1802 (Diplopoda) and the specific name of *Armadillo vulgaris* Latreille, 1804 (Crustacea, Isopoda), and the application for a ruling on the status of the name *Armadillo* Latreille, 1802 (Crustacea, Isopoda)
(Case 2909; see BZN 52: 236–244; 53: 120–122)

Pekka T. Lehtinen

Zoological Museum, University of Turku, 20500 Turku, Finland

Reading the comments on the application to solve the problem of the name *Armadillo* Latreille, 1802 I have the impression that the complicated history was not carefully studied by those commenting (BZN 53: 120–122). In this case we are not dealing with a simple situation of a much-used younger name and a less-used older name, but with the synonymy of names for two taxa that are now placed in different families.

I agree that the name *Armadillo* Latreille, 1802 has been much used in the sense of Brandt ([1831]) for a group of woodlice in the family ARMADILLIDAE Brandt in Brandt & Ratzeburg, [1831]. However, *Armadillo* Latreille is actually a subjective synonym of *Armadillidium* Brandt, [1831] (family ARMADILLIDIIDAE Brandt, 1833) (para. 12 of the application), since Latreille's (1802) and (1804) description of *Armadillo* was based solely on specimens that are now called *Armadillidium vulgare* (Latreille, 1804). The proposed (para. 14) type species *Armadillo officinalis* Duméril, 1816 belongs in Brandt's family ARMADILLIDAE (see paras. 9 and 12 of the application), but was not originally included and possibly not known to Latreille.

In placing *Armadillidium* on the Official List in 1928 (Opinion 104) with the type species '*vulgare* Latreille, 1804, *armadillo* Linnaeus, 1758' the Commission accepted that *Armadillidium* was based on the original concept of *Armadillo*. *Armadillidium* was withdrawn from the List in 1958 following recognition of unused earlier synonyms of *vulgare* and *armadillo* as composite (para. 2 of the application).

I willingly support most suggestions to stabilize names which have been much used, but the acceptance of two synonyms (*Armadillo* and *Armadillidium*) as the type genera of different families would be confusing and not stabilizing. The only realistic way to preserve Latreille's *Armadillo* would be to reject the younger (but very well used) synonym *Armadillidium*. This equally confusing solution has never been proposed.

My proposal (BZN 52: 241) to solve the nomenclatural problem outlined in this case was not made 'in favour' of the unused name *Pentheus* C.L. Koch, [1841], but its adoption in place of *Armadillo* Latreille is the only solution that does not violate all the basic rules and is valid under the Code, and it is certainly the least confusing. Moreover, the widely-used family-group name CUBARIDAE Brandt, 1833 could be resurrected in place of ARMADILLIDAE.

Comment on the proposed conservation of the generic names *Crenitis* Bedel, 1881, *Georissus* Latreille, 1809 and *Oosternum* Sharp, 1882 (Insecta, Coleoptera)
(Case 2925; see BZN 53: 99–103)

A. Smetana

*Eastern Cereal and Oilseed Research Centre, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada,
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0C6, Canada*

I am in full support of the well documented application by M. Hansen for the conservation of the three names *Crenitis*, *Georissus* and *Oosternum* by the suppression of their senior objective synonyms.

The action is particularly important in the case of the genus *Crenitis* that was already conserved by the Commission after being threatened by another senior synonym (details in the application). The generic name *Crenitis* is in fact the Greek noun meaning 'growing near a spring' (e.g. for plants), which is undoubtedly of feminine gender (see Liddell & Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon*).

The name *Georissus* (or *Georyssus*) was also consistently used in several recent, not strictly taxonomic papers, dealing with larval (Emden, 1956) or adult morphology (most recently Oliva, 1992). The names *Georissus* and *Oosternum* are used in a recent work dealing with the families and subfamilies of Coleoptera (Lawrence & Newton, 1995) that will be used as the standard reference for a long time.

Additional references

- Emden, F.I. van. 1956. The *Georissus* larva — a hydrophilid. *Proceedings of the Royal Entomological Society of London*, (A)31: 2–24.
- Lawrence, J.F. & Newton, A.F., Jr. 1995. Families and subfamilies of Coleoptera (with selected genera, notes, references and data on family-group names). Pp. 779–1006 in Pakaluk, J. & Allipinski, S.A. (Eds.), *Biology, phylogeny, and classification of Coleoptera. Papers celebrating the 80th birthday of Roy A. Crowson*. Warszawa.
- Oliva, A. 1992. Cuticular microstructure in some genera of Hydrophilidae (Coleoptera) and their phylogenetic significance. *Bulletin de l'Institut Royal des Sciences Naturelles de Belgique, Entomologie*, 62: 33–56.

Comments on the proposed conservation of some mammal generic names first published in Brisson's (1762) *Regnum Animale*

(Case 2928; see BZN 51: 135–146, 266–267, 342–348; 52: 78–93, 187–192, 271–275, 347–350; 53: 191–192)

(1) Claude Dupuis

*Entomologie, Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, 45 rue de Buffon, F-75005
Paris, France*